

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/691,589	10/18/2000	Lirio Quintero	154-12786-US-CIP	5046
23770	7590 07/15/2004		EXAMINER	
PAULA D. MORRIS & ASSOCIATES, P.C. d/b/a THE MORRIS LAW FIRM, P.C.			METZMAIER, DANIEL S	
10260 WEST	HEIMER, SUITE 360		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
HOUSTON,	TX 77042-3110		1712	
			DATE MAILED: 07/15/2004	,

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TOL-326 (Re		ion Summary	Part of Paper No./Mail Date 07102004
1) Notice 2) Notice 3) Inform	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)	ummary (PTO-413) //Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Attachment			
* S	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of		received.
	Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau		received in this National Stage
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority		
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents		
•	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).
	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119		
			- C36 / M. O.
11) 🔲 -	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached	S) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). Office Action or form PTO 152
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the objec		
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according to the drawing may not request that any objection to the		
	The specification is objected to by the Examine		
	•		
Applicati	on Papers		
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.	
7)	Claim(s) 102-104 is/are objected to.		
	Claim(s) 15 is/are rejected.	and to discover.	
	Claim(s) <u>2-14,25,29,43-46,49,50,80-101 and 1</u>		adon.
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>37-42 and 53-79</u> is/a		
4)⊠	Claim(s) 2-15,25,29,37-46,49,50 and 53-193 is	c/are pending in the english	ation
Dispositi	on of Claims		
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matt	ers, prosecution as to the merits is
		action is non-final.	
1)[Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/2	4/2003; 4/8/2004 &4/29/20	<u>004</u> .
Status			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a r y within the statutory minimum of thin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON	ty (30) days will be considered timely. THIS from the mailing date of this communication.
A SH	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL	Y IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 M	ONTH(S) EPOM
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apports Reply	pears on the cover sheet wi	ith the correspondence address
		Daniel S. Metzmaier	1712
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		09/691,589	QUINTERO, LIRIO
		Application No.	Applicant(s)

Application/Control Number: 09/691,589

Art Unit: 1712

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 2-15, 25, 29-29, 37-42, 43-46, 49-50, 53-79 and 80-193 are pending.

Claims 37-42 and 53-79 have been withdrawn as directed to non-elected inventions.

Election/Restrictions

- 1. This application contains claims 37-42 and 53-79 drawn to an invention nonelected without traverse in the reply filed on October 8, 2002.
- 2. Regarding the prior art below the claims are interpreted as not requiring said silicate solution. Claims are given their broadest reasonable interpretation. See MPEP 2111.

Double Patenting

3. Claims 102-104 objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claims 3, 6, and 9. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

The applicants should check the 145 pending claims for any and all occurrences of duplicate claims and take appropriate action. In particular claim 101 claims a broad and a narrow range for the number of carbons in the polyoxyethylene alcohols. Claims are given their broadest reasonable interpretation and said narrow range has been given patentable no weight. To the extent applicants intended the first range to define the number of carbons in the "alkane sulfates, alkaline sulfonates, and phosphate

esters", applicants should specifically review the remaining claims for occurrences of duplicate claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Otrhalek et al, US 4,032,466. Otrhalek et al (example 3 and claims, particularly claim 8) discloses compositions reading on the claims. Said compositions (all parts are by weight see column 8, lines 59-62) comprise 12 parts alpha-alkyl-omega-hydroxy poly(oxyethylene) with an average of 9 moles of oxyethylene, 4 parts of linear alkyl sulfonic acid, denoted as Calsoft LAS-99, and 30 parts of 37% hydrochloric acid. The nonionic (12) to anionic (4) ratio equates to 75/25, which reads on the claimed ratios. The pH would have been inherent to the 30 parts of the 37% hydrochloric acid. Typical pH of a 0.1N HCl solution is pH = 0.1. 0.1N equates to about a 3.6% hydrochloric acid solution. The concentration of the hydrochloric acid media of Otrhalek et al is an order of magnitude greater and would have been expected to have a pH of 1 or less.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 6. Claims 2-14, 25, 29, 43-46, 49-50, 80-101, 105-193 are allowed.
- 7. The indicated allowability of claim 15 has been withdrawn in view of applicants' amendments. Specifically, the allowable claims required "polymerization of

Application/Control Number: 09/691,589

Art Unit: 1712

encapsulating material" wherein amended claim 15 requires "media adapted to initiate acid reactive polymerization upon exposure to polymerizable silicate solution". Since encapsulation is no longer required of said media and the only requirement for said polymerization is an aqueous acid of sufficient acidity, said claims are now deemed to read on the prior art.

Response to Arguments

- 8. Applicant's arguments filed October 24, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 9. Applicants (page 22 and 23) argue the Otrhalek et al reference teaches a flocculating agents and the instant claims require encapsulation. Said arguments were made prior additional amendments, which moot the statements. Said claims no longer require said encapsulation capability.
- 10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 15 and 102-104 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection and/or objections.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Application/Control Number: 09/691,589

Art Unit: 1712

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Page 5

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel S. Metzmaier whose telephone number is (703) 308-0451. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy P. Gulakowski can be reached on (571) 272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Daniel S. Metzmaier Primary Examiner Art Unit 1712